DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 588 RC 007 645

AUTHOR Durant, Thomas J., Jr.
TITLE Work Orientation Attitudes of Rural Low-Income Residents of Three South Central Virginia Counties.
PUB DATE 6 Feb 74
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists Meetings, February 3-6, 1974, Memphis, Tenn.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Area Studies; Economic Development; *Goal Orientation; Heads of Households; Job Satisfaction; Life Style; *Low Income Groups; Minority Groups; Occupational Aspiration; Policy Formation; Program Planning; *Rural Population; Self Concept; Social Problems; *Socioeconomic Influences; Welfare Recipients; *Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Virginia

ABSTRACT

The study determined the relation between specific social factors and situational conditions of poverty and non-poverty heads of households and their orientation toward work. The major hypotheses tested was that respondents affected more by adverse social factors and situational conditions will develop less positive work orientations. Data were obtained from a July 1971 rural manpower survey conducted in 3 low-income counties of south central Virginia. A combination of systematic and stratified sampling was employed. A total of 713 surveys were conducted, covering 2 separate lists of residents in each county: the general population of heads of households, and welfare recipients. The dependent variable of work orientation attitude was measured by 4 tests: (1) life aspirations; (2) work ethic; (3) lack of confidence; and (4) acceptability of welfare. The independent variables were categorized as: (1) life style variables; (2) situational variables; and (3) attitudinal variables. Findings suggested that many persons affected by adverse social problems and situational conditions in fact are willing to work and do have a relatively positive outlook on life. Findings also suggested that some of those who are on welfare do not wish to remain on welfare. The 7 conclusions and recommendations covered such areas as broadening existing work incentives and improving living conditions. (KM)

ED 087588

RECEIVED
FEB 18 1974
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

WORK ORIENTATION ATTITUDES OF RURAL LOW-INCOME RESIDENTS OF THREE SOUTH CENTRAL VIRGINIA COUNTIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Thomas J. Durant, Jr., Ph.D.
(Sociology)

Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists Meetings
February 3-6, 1974
Memphis, Tennessee

RC007645

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION

Approaches to the Study of Work Orientation Attitudes 2
Problem 3
Objectives of the Study 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 4

METHODOLOGY

Dependent Variable 5
Independent Variables 5
General Hypothesis Tested 6

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Work Orientation: Way of Life Aspirations 6
Work Orientation: Work Ethic 7
Work Orientation: Lack of Confidence in Work Success 7
Work Orientation: Acceptability of Welfare 8

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary 9
Conclusions 10

APPENDIX

Work Orientation Tests and Items 12
Tables 14

WORK ORIENTATION ATTITUDES OF RURAL LOW-INCOME RESIDENTS OF THREE SOUTH CENTRAL VIRGINIA COUNTIES*

by
Thomas J. Durant, Jr.**

Introduction

Work orientation has been defined as comprising four elements: (1) attitude toward work - like or dislike for work; (2) goals of work - what one hopes to obtain from work; (3) beliefs about ability to achieve goals; and (4) intentions and decisions on achieving one's goals under different conditions (Goodwin, 1971). In this sense, work orientation attitudes reflect one's perceived chances of achieving an active economic life in the world of work.

The orientation of an individual toward the world of work, thus, is an important element in the selection of an occupational career, in attaining work satisfaction, and in the process of achieving a given social status. The understanding of work orientation attitudes of the poor and non-poor is, therefore, of major significance to those involved in this process. For example, a major concern of many state and federal government agencies is the reduction in the level of unemployment. Some agencies have established as their policy to reduce unemployment by locating or creating jobs for those who are willing and able to work.[1] These efforts, however, have been plagued by several problems. First, how can jobs be created for the lowly educated, the unskilled or semi-skilled, and the unemployed? Secondly, in what capacity and to what degree are the unemployed or marginally employed willing and able

---

*The research in this paper was conducted in collaboration with the Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Dr. Huey J. Battle, Director; Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia.

This paper was prepared for the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists Meetings, February 3-6, 1974, Memphis, Tennessee.

**The author is Assistant Professor of Sociology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

[1]In 1935, the Federal Works Program took as its chief objective to provide employment for about 3,500,000 persons, nearly all of whom were drawn from relief rolls. This policy was basically one involving rural rehabilitation of destitute farm families through loans, grants, and direct employment (Farnham and Link, 1938).

More recently, in 1967, the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty recommended that the United States Government "stand ready to provide jobs at the national minimum wage or better, to every unemployed person willing and able to work" (The People Left Behind, 1967).

to secure jobs? And third, assuming that employment can be obtained, how is the security of their jobs maintained? Sociologically, how are the social and economic rewards of their employment related to their life styles and life chances? And, in turn, how do life styles and perceived life chances affect the nature and development of work orientation attitudes?

Whether or not a person becomes employed and remains employed in a given capacity rests largely on how he views the world of work, the work system, his life chances and opportunities, and the limitations imposed upon him by the environment in which he lives. This problem can be linked in many ways to the nature of the stratification system of the American Society (Goodwin, 1972). Blau and Duncan hold that the occupation which one possesses defines his social status in society and that occupations, in general, is the foundation of the American system of stratification (Blau and Duncan, 1967). Weber observed that an individual's work abilities and skills determine the degree and extent of his command over material and social resources, which in turn influences his attitudes and feelings toward life in general (Weber, 1953). Moreover, Youmans has noted the importance of an occupation to the individual; that is, a job gives a man something to do, defines a meaningful role for him, offers him opportunities to develop friendship and achieve social recognition among his peers, provides him with income, social life and other meaningful activities, and generally maintains his community status (Youmans, 1967). An understanding of work orientation attitudes, thus, may enable us to better understand differential involvement in the system of work, the occupational structure, and in general, the system of stratification of the American Society. Research which emphasizes the above may hold implications for policy development aimed at improving the social and economic condition of occupationally disadvantaged persons.

Approaches to the Study of Work Orientation Attitudes

Several veins of thought and research have characterized contemporary sociological and social psychological approaches to the study of work values. One vein has emphasized the relevance of whether or not the poor want to work. This approach may be properly conceptualized as work orientation or the meaning of work. The major focus of this approach concerns the problem of "do the poor want to work." This approach, however, represents a relatively new entry into the sociological and social psychological research inventories.

Another vein of thought makes the assumption that, indeed, the poor want to work, and is more concerned with the larger problem of the most appropriate method of integrating the poor into the system of work. This approach may be conceptualized as work integration.

A third and final approach which is more general and indirect is subsumed under what is commonly known as the culture of poverty. It can be inferred from this approach that attitudes pertaining to orientation toward work of the chronically poor are derived from the social-cultural milieu in which they live and follow a cyclical recurrent pattern. The assumptions

underlying this approach are suspect, however, since it has been shown that the chronically poor may have middle-class work orientations (Durant, 1966). There are also research findings to the effect that any differences in orientation between the poor and the non-poor are the results of the poor's adaptation to the situation facts of life and employment and that they do not reflect cultural differences (Roach, 1967).

While the focus of the above approaches are important in their own right, there is a more basic problem which merits attention; namely, what are the social conditions surrounding one's life which are associated with the development of a certain type and nature of work orientation attitude. This is largely the concern of this study.

Problem

In a social psychological study of work orientation, Goodwin raises the issue of "do the poor want to work." In his investigation, he studied the work orientation of poor and more affluent persons in an attempt to discover whether the unemployed and underemployed have basically different orientations toward work than the regularly employed. "Is the American Society stratified in such a way that the poor can be distinguished from the non-poor by the way they view the important social activity of employment" (Goodwin, 1972).

In addition to the above problem identified by Goodwin, a more basic problem related to orientation toward work deserves attention; namely, are there differential social and economic conditions which characterize the life styles of the poor and the non-poor which may assist in explaining variation in attitudes toward work? If so, what is the nature and extent of the differences? The major problem of this study, therefore, is to determine the extent to which work orientation attitudes are associated with social problems and situational conditions surrounding the lives of poor and non-poor residents of a rural low-income area in south central Virginia. This problem is based on the premise that social problems, environmental factors, and situational conditions characterizing inhabitants of the study area influence to a significant degree their orientation toward work. In turn, these attitudes reflect in varying degrees, life chances for social and economic development and improvement in quality of living.

Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study is to ascertain and analyze the social conditions and work orientation attitudes of low and moderate income residents of a rural area in south central Virginia. The specific objective is to determine the relation between specific social and situational conditions of poverty and non-poverty household heads and their orientation toward work. The practical objective is to determine the social problems existing in a low-income rural area and their sociological implications for economic development, and to develop a set of recommendations for developmental planning, policy directives, and program implementation on the basis of the findings of this study.

Theoretical Framework

The basic assumption underlying this analysis is that all individuals live within a social environment. The normative character of the institutional subsystems within the environment, i.e., family, religion, educational, political and economic, shape attitudes and behavior through a wide range of socialization patterns. In addition, certain types of life styles are created within the social environment. The essence of life style is the quality of living which defines one's position or status, and assess to those conditions and experiences that constitute the good life (Haller, 1971).

Orientation toward work is shaped by the nature and extent of participation in the institutional subsystems, in this case, the economic system or the occupational world of work. This process is also affected by the structural nature of the institutional subsystems. Adaptation, adjustment and reactions must be made to social problems or adverse situational conditions which are created by the social structure and process involving the individual. Through this process attitudinal orientations are formed and are, thus, viewed as a function of the social environment, the nature of the relationships to the environmental subsystems, and the resulting life styles. It is assumed, in conclusion, that life styles determine to a large degree life chances or opportunities for social and economic improvement and the enhancement of life goals.

Methodology

In July of 1971 a rural manpower survey was conducted in three low-income counties of south central Virginia. A combination of systematic and stratified sampling was employed in selecting the sample. The sampling stratification called for two lists. The first list was composed of residents from each county taken from institutional records.[1] The second list was composed of welfare recipients of each county and was secured from the respective welfare offices. This process resulted in two lists for each county--the general population of heads of households, and the welfare recipients. For each county, a systematic sample was chosen from each list, selecting the first person at random from the list by drawing a number from a hat. The number in the hat corresponded to the total population in the list divided by the number of people to be interviewed. Thereafter, every nth person was selected.[2] A total of 738 sample surveys were completed of the

---

[1]The lists of potential interviewees were taken from the following sources: personal property tax records and the county extension service list of rural residents. These sources were supplemented with names from church membership records and county hunting license records.

[2]For more detailed information on the sampling procedure see Philip M. Scherer, "Rural Southern Residents and the Incentive to Work," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia, pp. 76-81.

original 935 potential respondents. This number was further reduced to 713 due to incomplete information on a small number of the surveys. The interviewing was conducted by trained local residents of each county.

Dependent Variable (Work Orientation Attitude)

The dependent variable was conceptualized as work orientation attitude. Work orientation was measured by four tests developed by Goodwin: (1) Life Aspirations, (2) Work Ethic, (3) Lack of Confidence, and (4) Acceptability of Welfare. Each test included a series of items or questions designed to measure work orientation.[1] For the tests concerned with life aspirations and work ethic, a four (on a four-point scale) was considered the most positive response and interpreted as meaning that for the question at hand the respondent's orientation toward work was very favorable. Whereas for the tests concerning lack of confidence and acceptability of welfare, a four was the least favorable response in respect to work orientations. Each test was given an average score, that is, the answers in each test were summed and divided by the number of responses in that test. The average scores had a possible range of one to four.

Independent Variables[2]

The multiple independent variables were categorized under three major headings: Life Style Variables, Situational Variables, and Attitudinal Variables:

Life Style Variables (Quality of Living)

1. educational level (years of formal schooling)
2. occupational level
3. income level (annual income of head and spouse)

Situational Variables

1. housing condition
2. housing status
3. welfare status
4. poverty status[3]

---

[1]The items in each test were designed to measure the respondent's attitude toward an active economic life. The tests and items are given in the Appendix.

[2]In this paper, only three of the independent variables were analyzed--educational level, income level, and poverty status. The analysis of the remainder of the variables will be reported in a separate paper.

[3]See Table 13 of Appendix for measure of poverty status.

Attitudinal Variables

1. educational aspiration for children
2. level of living satisfaction

Control Variables

1. age
2. sex
3. color

General Hypothesis Tested: Poverty status, low education and low income will be negatively related to work orientation attitudes. In other words, the lower the education and income, the more negative the work orientation attitude. This pattern of relation will also exist between poverty status and work orientation.

Discussion of Findings

One major point to note in this section is that each of the four tests included in the analysis measures a different aspect of work orientation. All of the questions or items in each test are related to the respondent's attitude toward an active economic life, especially their work (See Appendix for tests and items).

Work Orientation: Way of Life Aspirations

The data revealed that the average score for all respondents with reference to way of life aspirations was 3.5 on a four-point scale. This indicates that the respondents as a whole aspired for the best way of life. This finding is supported further when life aspiration was cross-tabulated with poverty status. Both poverty and non-poverty status respondents aspired for the best way of life. About 46 percent of the poverty status persons and 48 percent of the non-poverty status persons aspired for the best way of life. Most of the remaining respondents of both poverty and non-poverty statuses ranked near the middle of the scale, which indicates a fairly high life aspiration. Very few of the respondents ranked near the lower end of the scale, that is, aspiring to live the worst way of life (Table 1).

It was found also that low income as well as high income persons aspired for the best way of living. Although there was a slightly greater portion of high income persons located at the uppermost point on the life aspiration scale, this was not significantly different from the proportions of respondents with low and medium income levels respectively (Table 2).

Contrary to expectations, a moderately strong inverse negative relation was found between education and life aspirations. Surprisingly, there were higher proportions with low and medium educational levels respectively, who

aspired for the best way of life than the proportion in the high educational level category. This finding is somewhat reduced in significance, however, when the second highest point on the life aspiration scale is considered. There was a greater proportion of respondents with above high school education possessing middle range life aspiration scores than those at the low or medium educational levels. When the medium and high life aspiration scores are combined, the difference between all educational levels is reduced. A slightly greater but insignificant proportion of those with low education possessed moderately low life aspiration scores as compared to those with high education (Table 3).

Work Orientation: Work Ethic

A higher proportion of non-poverty status persons than poverty status persons held positive attitudes toward work ethic. At the highest point on the work ethic scale, however, poverty status persons were represented by a larger proportion than non-poverty persons. Noteworthy is the fact that most persons, whether poverty or non-poverty, fell below the highest or most positive point on the work ethic scale. This indicates that the respondents as a whole possessed less positive attitudes toward work ethic than toward life aspirations. One factor which seems clear up to this point is that poverty status persons as a whole possessed just as positive attitudes toward work ethic and life aspirations as did non-poverty status persons (Table 4).

It was also revealed that work orientation as measured by the work ethic test did not differ significantly between those with low and medium levels of education. Work ethic attitudes were moderately positive in this respect. There was a lack of high representation (proportion-wise) at the upper or most positive point on the work ethic scale. In addition, there was a significantly smaller proportion with high education holding extremely positive work ethic attitudes than was the case for those at the medium and low educational levels. When the proportions at the two uppermost points on the work ethic scale are combined within each category for education, however, most of the above difference is reduced (Table 5).

When income was cross-classified with work ethic, it was found that a moderately strong positive relation existed between the two variables. In other words, as income increased, work ethic attitudes tended to become more positive. This finding indicates that income is a major factor in influencing work ethic and that income (compared with an earlier finding) is of greater immediate importance than education in producing favorable work orientation attitudes (Table 6).

Work Orientation: Lack of Confidence in Work Success

Poverty status persons were found to have less confidence of success in work than non-poverty status persons. Accordingly, a smaller portion of poverty status respondents as compared to non-poverty status respondents were

located at the positive end of the scale (i.e., with low lack of confidence scores) (Table 7). The mean score for all respondents on the confidence of success scale was 2.5. Thus, while confidence of success of the respondents as a whole was not very high nor was it extremely low as indicated by the middle-range mean score of 2.5.

A strong negative relation was found between educational level and lack of confidence. That is, the lower the educational level of the respondents, the lower their confidence of success in work. Conversely, the higher the educational level, the higher the confidence of success in the world of work. This indicates, therefore, that the least educated did not have as much confidence in succeeding in the world of work as those with high education, and consequently, their work orientation was less favorable (Table 8).

A relatively strong negative relation was also observed between income level and confidence in work success. Those with lower incomes tended to possess a lower degree of confidence in work success than those with higher income levels. This was determined in part by collapsing the upper half of the confidence scale and the lower half respectively, and comparing these combined proportions. Thus, those who were worst off, income-wise, tended to lack confidence in the world of work to a greater extent than those who were more financially secure (Table 9).

The above findings should be interpreted with caution, however, since a fairly substantial proportion of the respondents with low education and low income showed a middle-range to moderately high level of confidence in work success. Only a few respondents fell at the most negative end of the scale. Thus, the above comparisons are more meaningful from a relative point of view. The above findings also suggest that the overall mean confidence score was deflated by lower or extreme cases which primarily characterized those with low education and low income. The mean confidence score of 2.5 also indicated that for many respondents, sure success in the world of work was not anticipated.

A similar study to the present one found, in addition, that black respondents were less confident of success in the world of work than were white respondents, and younger persons were more confident than older persons (Scherer, 1972). When it is considered that blacks represented a high proportion of those on welfare in the study, their lower score on the confidence in work success scale seems understandable. Those on welfare also tended to be yound or middle-aged adults. The above findings indicate that persons who have not achieved a satisfactory level of education or employment through some fault of their own or the system will <u>not</u> view their chances of being successful in the world of work as being very good.

<u>Work Orientation: Acceptability of Welfare</u>

Based on the data shown in Table 10, it is clear that poverty status respondents as a whole were more inclined toward the acceptance of welfare

than non-poverty status respondents. Thirty percent of the poverty status respondents reported low acceptability of welfare scores as compared to 60 percent of the non-poverty status respondents. Moreover, only about 10 percent of the non-poverty status respondents exhibited extremely high acceptability of welfare scores as compared to 25 percent of the poverty status respondents. In sum, those in poverty as a whole were more willing to accept welfare than non-poverty persons. This suggests that attitude or orientation toward work may be created by conditions of poverty.

The data revealed a strong inverse relation between educational level and acceptability of welfare. In other words, high education was associated more with low acceptability of welfare and, conversely, low education was associated more with high acceptance of welfare (Table 11).

The same general pattern as exhibited above with education was also revealed when income level was cross-tabulated with acceptability of welfare. Accordingly, a large proportion of persons with low income were more receptive of welfare than were persons with a medium or high level of income. About 92 percent of those with high income levels were characterized by low acceptability of welfare scores as compared to 60 percent of those with low income levels (Table 12).

The above results illustrate several interesting points: That is, high education and high income yield a lack of dependence on welfare whereas low education and low income promote greater dependence on welfare. And, secondly, at least some persons with low education and low income did not desire to receive welfare, but a significant proportion of them do (see also Scherer, 1972). It seems, therefore, that policy aimed at producing more satisfactory levels of education and income may aid in limiting or reducing the ranks of those on welfare or the number of potential welfare recipients.

Summary and Conclusions

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the relation between specific social factors and situational conditions of poverty and non-poverty heads of households and their orientation toward work. The major hypothesis tested was that respondents affected by more adverse social factors and situational conditions will develop less positive work orientations. In addition, it was expected that poverty status respondents would express less favorable work orientations than non-poverty respondents.

The hypothesis was supported for specific aspects of work orientation but was not supported for others. For example, the hypothesis was supported when subjected to the Lack of Confidence of Work Success Test and the Acceptability of Welfare Test. The hypothesis was not supported, however,

when subjected to the Life Aspiration Test and the Work Ethic Test. In the case of the latter tests, it was found that poverty status respondents held almost as positive work orientation attitudes as non-poverty respondents. In addition, there was no significant difference between educational level or income level and life aspirations or work ethic respectively.

The hypothesis, however, was supported by the Lack of Confidence in Work Success Test and the Acceptability of Welfare Test. Accordingly, poverty status, low education, and low income were associated respectively with lack of confidence in success in the world of work and with the acceptability of welfare.

These findings suggest that many persons affected by adverse social problems and situational conditions in fact are willing to work and do have a relatively positive outlook on life. Many such persons, while willing to work, in fact do not because of the adverse social conditions and situations confronted. Thus, many come to lack confidence in their ability to succeed in the world of work and consequently are more inclined toward the acceptance of welfare. It is important to add that these findings suggest that some of those who are on welfare do not wish to remain on welfare.

Conclusions

The conclusions and recommendations which follow are based on the findings of this study.

1. Since most respondents held positive life aspirations, it seems that a certain degree of incentive to work was already present. In order to broaden and expand this incentive, a general awareness of the importance of life goals may serve to assist persons in seeking or selecting means and alternatives. This means the development of a sound educational and awareness program in addition to institutional support.

2. Quality of living in the study area was below that for the rest of the state as a whole. Thus, efforts should be made to bring persons who live in this area up to par with those who reside in the rest of the state and the nation. This means improvement in rural education, occupations and employment, housing conditions, health conditions and health care, and other factors which adversely affect the area.

3. Most of those on welfare were young and black. Thus, policy should be geared to developing programs to assist this group and check its potential growth. This means more training, more jobs, better jobs and increases in income so that quality of living may be improved and non-welfare incentive can be promoted.

4. Many persons in the poverty category expressed the desire to work but held a low degree of confidence in success. Thus, there is a need for more manpower development and training geared in the right direction.

5. Poverty status persons are more receptive of welfare. Thus, programs to reduce the ranks of those in poverty will also assist in limiting or reducing the number on welfare. Some of those on welfare do not desire to remain on welfare.

APPENDIX

Work Orientation Tests and Items

Interviewer: Read: "I am going to read some statements which might happen to you in life and which I want you to evaluate in terms of being the best way of life or the worst way of life. (Hand card to respondent. Use this card as a reference in answering. It has a ladder with numbered rungs.) To answer a one (1) would indicate the 'worst way of life' and a four (4) would indicate the 'best way of life.' You may choose any specific number from one to four."

Way of Life Aspiration Test	Rating
1. Having a regular job.	_____
2. Getting along with your family.	_____
3. Being honest.	_____
4. Having a job that you like.	_____
5. Having a nice place to live and plenty of food.	_____
6. Having plenty of money to get what you want.	_____
7. Making this a better world to live in.	_____

Acceptability of Welfare Test

1. Having the government give you a decent place to live and enough food and clothing. _____
2. Being on welfare to get enough to live on. _____

Read: "Now I have some statements about work. (Hand card 6 to respondent.) Take the last card. This too has a ladder with numbered rungs, but this time a one(1) indicates you disagree and a four (4) indicates you agree. Again, you may answer any of the numbers shown."

Work Ethic Test

1. Work should be the most important part of a person's life. _____
2. To me, it's important to have the kind of work that gives me a chance to develop my own special abilities. _____
3. Work is a good builder of character. _____

4. Success in an occupation is mainly a matter of how much effort you put into it. _____
5. Hard work makes you a better person. _____
6. If I don't have a regular job, I don't feel right. _____
7. Most people like to work. _____

Lack of Confidence in Work Success Test

1. To be really successful in life, you have to care about making money. _____
2. Success in an occupation is mainly a matter of luck. _____
3. To me, work is nothing more than a way of making a living. _____
4. Success in an occupation is mainly a matter of knowing the right people. _____

Table 1. Life Aspirations by Poverty Status

Status	Life Aspiration Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Poverty	1(.04)	5(2.0)	128(51.2)	116(46.4)	250	99.6
Non-Poverty	0(.00)	7(1.5)	232(50.1)	224(48.4)	463	100.0
Total	1	12	360	340	713	100.0

*4 = best way of life; 1 = worst way of life.

Table 2. Life Aspirations by Income Level

Income Level	Life Aspiration Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Low	1(.22)	9(2.0)	223(50.2)	211(47.5)	444	99.9
Medium	0(.00)	3(1.6)	92(48.7)	94(49.7)	189	100.0
High	0(.00)	0(.00)	45(57.0)	34(43.0)	79	100.0
Total	1	12	360	339	712	100.0

*4 = best way of life; 1 = worst way of life.

Table 3. Life Aspirations by Educational Level

Educational Level	Life Aspiration Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Low	0(.00)	11(2.0)	278(49.3)	275(48.8)	564	100.1
Medium	1(1.0)	1(1.0)	51(52.0)	45(45.9)	98	99.9
High	0(.00)	0(.00)	31(64.6)	17(35.4)	48	100.0
Total	1	12	360	337	710	100.0

*4 = best way of life; 1 = worst way of life.

Table 4. Work Ethic by Poverty Status

Status	Work Ethic Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Poverty	0(.00)	48(19.2)	167(66.8)	35(14.0)	250	100.0
Non-Poverty	6(1.3)	67(14.5)	349(75.3)	41(8.8)	463	99.9
Total	6	115	516	76	713	100.0

*4 = positive work ethic; 1 = negative work ethic.

Table 5. Work Ethic by Educational Level

Educational Level	Work Ethic Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Low	6(1.1)	94(16.7)	401(71.1)	63(11.2)	564	100.1
Medium	0(.00)	16(16.3)	70(71.4)	12(12.2)	98	99.9
High	0(.00)	5(10.4)	43(89.6)	0(.00)	48	100.0
Total	6	115	514	75	710	100.0

*4 = positive work ethic; 1 = negative work ethic.

Table 6. Work Ethic by Income Level

Income Level	Work Ethic Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Low	3(.7)	81(18.2)	300(67.6)	60(13.5)	444	100.1
Medium	3(1.6)	30(15.9)	144(76.2)	12(6.3)	189	100.0
High	0(.00)	4(5.1)	71(89.9)	4(5.1)	79	100.1
Total	6	115	515	76	712	100.0

*4 = positive work ethic; 1 - negative work ethic.

Table 7. Lack of Confidence in Work Success by Poverty Status

Status	Lack of Confidence Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Poverty	24(9.6)	115(46.0)	91(36.4)	20(8.0)	250	100.0
Non-Poverty	81(17.5)	237(51.2)	120(25.9)	25(5.4)	463	100.1
Total	105	352	211	45	713	100.0

*4 = less favorable score; 1 = most favorable score.

Table 8. Lack of Confidence in Work Success by Educational Level

Educational Level	Lack of Confidence Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Low	73(12.9)	272(48.2)	179(31.7)	40(7.1)	564	99.9
Medium	17(17.3)	53(54.1)	24(24.5)	4(4.1)	98	100.0
High	14(29.2)	26(54.2)	8(16.7)	0(.00)	48	100.1
Total	104	351	211	44	710	100.0

*4 = less favorable score; 1 = most favorable score.

Table 9. Lack of Confidence in Work Success by Income Level

Income Level	Lack of Confidence Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Low	53(11.9)	202(45.5)	151(34.4)	36(8.1)	444	99.9
Medium	37(19.6)	98(51.8)	46(24.3)	8(4.2)	189	99.9
High	15(19.0)	51(64.6)	12(15.2)	1(1.3)	79	100.1
Total	105	351	211	45	712	100.0

*4 = less favorable score; 1 = most favorable score.

Table 10. Acceptability of Welfare by Poverty Status

Status	Acceptability of Welfare Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Poverty	76(30.4)	111(44.4)	45(18.0)	18(7.21)	250	100.0
Non-Poverty	278(60.0)	137(29.6)	37(8.0)	11(2.4)	463	100.0
Total	354	248	82	29	713	100.0

*4 = less favorable score; 1 = most favorable score.

Table 11. Acceptability of Welfare by Educational Level

Educational Level	Acceptability of Welfare Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Low	254(46.7)	192(35.3)	73(13.4)	25(4.6)	544	100.0
Medium	56(57.1)	29(29.6)	9(9.2)	4(4.1)	98	99.9
High	42(87.5)	6(12.5)	0(.00)	0(.00)	48	100.0
Total	352	247	82	29	710	100.0

*4 = less favorable score; 1 = most favorable score.

Table 12. Acceptability of Welfare by Income Level

Income Level	Acceptability of Welfare Scale* 1	2	3	4	Total	Percent Row
Low	268(60.4)	1(.2)	175(39.4)	0(.00)	444	100.0
Medium	175(92.6)	2(1.1)	12(6.3)	0(.00)	189	100.0
High	73(92.4)	0(.00)	6(7.6)	0(.00)	79	100.0
Total	516	3	193	0	712	100.0

*4 = less favorable score; 1 = most favorable score.

Table 13. Income Criteria of Poverty Based on Family Size

Family Size	Income, Continental U.S., Non-Farm
1	$2,000
2	2,600
3	3,300
4	4,000
5	4,700
6	5,300
7	5,900

Source: "DOL Raises Income Levels Defining Poor Families," Manpower and Vocational Education Weekly, February 16, 1972, p. 9.

REFERENCES

1. Blau, Peter and O. D. Duncan, The American Occupational Structure, 1957.

2. Durant, Thomas J., "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Enrollees of Tuskegee Institute's Educational Program for Seasonally Employed Agricultural Workers," unpublished Master's Thesis, Tuskegee Institute 1966.

3. Farnham, Rebecca and Irene Link, Effects of the Works Program on Rural Relief, WPA, Division of Social Research, Monograph XIII, U. S. Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1938, p. xi.

4. Goodwin, Leonard, A Study of the Work Orientations of Welfare Recipients Participating in the Work Incentive Program, Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution, 1971, p. 15.

5. Goodwin, Leonard, Do the Poor Want to Work? A Social Psychological Study of Work Orientations, Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute, 1972, p. 2.

6. Haller, Archibald O., "What Constitutes Quality of Living," in The Quality of Rural Living, Proceedings of a Workshop, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D. C., 1971, p. 5.

7. Roach, Jack and Orville Gursslin, "An Evaluation of the Concept 'Culture of Poverty'," Social Forces, Vol. 45, March, 1967, pp. 383-392.

8. Scherer, Philip, "Rural Southern Residents and the Incentive to Work," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, 1972.

9. The People Left Behind, A report by the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1967, p. 19.

10. Weber, Max, "Class, Status, and Party," in Reinhardt Bendix and Seymour Lipset (eds.), Class Status and Power, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953, pp. 21-28.

11. Youmans, E. Grant, Older Rural Americans: A Sociological Perspective, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967, pp. 92-99.